Vol. XI, No. 9 HUMAN EVENTS March 3, 1954

MAR 8 1954 LIBRARY

PROGRESS

By FRANK CHODOROV

DID YOU EVER take your girl for a ride in a buggy drawn by a well-spavined horse? If not, your knowledge of vehicular love-making is deficient. You don't know, for instance, that one-hand or even no-hand driving can be as safe as operating on a porch; or that an osculatory impulse can be indulged without the necessity of being "out of gas". All you need in a horse and buggy is feminine cooperation, which is a necessity also in an automobile.

Despite this advantage over the automobile, there is much to be said for the latter means of transportation; so much, in fact, that its abolition is not to be considered. The time saved in getting from place to place, even if the time is wasted, is a consideration in its favor; and one cannot discount the jobs created by the automobile, including the building and (we hope) repairing of highways, to say nothing of the rest rooms provided by considerate gasoline station operators so that we may the better enjoy the scenery.

All things considered, the automobile may be put down as a mark of progress; it has improved the lot of man. The same can be said of many inventions, as, for instance, the match; imagine trying to keep a pipe lit with a flint box! When we try to define progress, we must include all those devices which men have thought up for the making of more things more easily. When science digs up out of inscrutable nature some hitherto unknown principle, we can reasonably say that man is getting on, and when that principle is put to man's use by way of a gadget, there can be no question that progress has been made. Even the super bombs now being manufactured, and decried, may turn out to be great boons for mankind in the abstract, though a bit rough on mankind at a particular time and place. For, despite the most dire forebodings, these bombs must miss at least one boy and girl, who will produce a new generation who will build a better world than the one blown to bits. Our civilization can be improved upon, you know.

YES, THERE WILL always be progress, youth being so infernally bent on it, and youth being so never-ending. The question is, how can one be sure that the thing touted as progress is the real thing, all wool and a yard wide? Maybe it's a fake. The tendency is to equate newness with progress, and to take newness at its face value. Too often a little research rubs the glitter off the latest thing, and it turns out to be something picked up from the rubbish of lost or decadent civilizations, refurbished and repackaged.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1954 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Take, for instance, our highly touted "democratic" army. It is nothing but a conscript army, no different in essence from what we used to decry as "czaristic". The fact that the ritual of impressment is more complicated does not alter the fact that the service is involuntary, that being drafted is in that respect the same thing as being shanghaied, which was the way Napoleon did it. In short, conscription is not new, and whether it is progressive depends on your point of view. You may say that the way we take care of our soldiers, by way of post-service emoluments and privileges, shows progress; but isn't that simply putting patriotism on a cash basis? Mercenary armies are not new.

A few years ago there marched into our economic midst, accompanied by a lot of professorial fanfare, a doctrine called Keynesianism. Its label guaranteed it to be an economic wonder drug, just discovered. Yet, when you rid the doctrine of its linguistic trimmings, including calculus, you recognize something that was thought up by a deviner of dreams some 6,000 years ago. For, Joseph (the fellow who was too straight-laced for Potiphar's wife) also said that the evils of depression could be mitigated by the proper manipulation of the taxing machinery: take what the people have when they are flush and hand it back when they are broke — minus, of course, the cost of management. True, Joseph did not think of the clever idea of printing money and handing it out when the people wanted their wheat; Keynesianism added that wrinkle, but even that was not new, for we find frequent instances of monarchial counterfeiting in the past. No, Keynesianism is hardly new. Is it a mark of progress? What's your test of progress?

Just before Keynesianism descended on us, the world was bathed in a brilliance of such magnitude that many people thought a new planet had entered the political firmament. It was called the New Deal. This was the millenium, indeed. After the heat had subsided, the gadget was carefully examined by an historian, who found it to be a polished-up artifact of ancient vintage; he wrote up his findings in a book called *The New Deal in Ancient Rome.* That's how old the New Deal is. And whether it can be called progressive depends on whether you would so evaluate the Age of Diocletian.

PROGRESS IMPLIES MOVEMENT, and movement towards something better. So, before you can describe a thing as progressive, you must first establish the goal you hope to gain. What is better than what? In some fields the answer is simple. If it's profits you're after, then you can say that your business is making progress because profits are accruing to it. You can demonstrate with a foot rule your progress in climbing Mount Everest.

But, when you are talking about a progressive society or civilization your job is not so easy; you are under obligation to describe a goal that is shrouded in values. And the funny thing about it is that in describing your goal you are bound to look to the past for its details. Even if you build an Utopia you have to borrow bricks from experience. You want to restore something that *was,* or conserve something that *has been.* You become a conservative. You want something new that is old.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For instance, let us assume that in your estimate of progress you specify that men should act according to the rules laid down in the Ten Commandments. Is that new? You might say that it would indeed be a new experience if people did not lie, steal, covet their neighbors' wives, and so on; so it would be; but, the goal you have in mind is as old as time. And you must be put down as a conservative; for a conservative is one who digs out of the immediate or distant past a standard of behavior or action that to him seems good and tries to make that standard prevail.

Our most prominent educators are advocating a system they call "progressive" and "new", but when you examine their advertised goal you see that, whether they know it or not, they are striving for an ancient value. Let's see!

In the traditional education which the "progressives" are trying to displace, the aim is to impart to the individual child as much learning as he is capable of absorbing, so that he might make the best of his capacities. He is treated as an individual, not as part of the mass, and is encouraged to excel the others, if he has it in him.

The "new" education rejects that goal; it relegates the child to membership in a group, and the highest goal of this system is to fit him into the pattern of that group; he must be trained to adjust himself to the mass, not to excel. This is the doctrine of majoritarianism, which proclaims that the will of the majority is the will of all, and discounts personal differences. Since the majority expresses its will through the political machinery, the ultimate aim of "progressive" education is to train the child for ready acceptance of the going political order. But that too was the Spartan ideal; the purpose of education in Sparta was to prepare him for service for the State. The goal of "progressive" education is a veritable throwback.

The collectivist fellows — which includes those who call themselves socialists, communists, Fabians or New Dealers — are most atavistic. The gist of their common idea is to liquidate free choice, to place the economic (if not the cultural and spiritual) destiny of society in the hands of an omniscient and omnipotent State; the means for accomplishing this purpose is the abolition of private property, so that existence is by leave of the State, and the measure of "progress" is the extent to which private property has been forbidden by law. (The differences between the various groups are in the degrees of ownership they believe should be permitted.)

But, there is really nothing new in the goal advocated by these collectivists, except the language in which they clothe it. Anthropologists tell us of ancient tribes in which common ownership was the going order, with the chief in complete command of the distribution of the tribal stores; and until the Nineteenth Century authoritarianism was nearly always and nearly everywhere the accepted way of life. What the collectivists call "progress" is really a restoration of a tradition discarded a couple of centuries ago.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IT IS CUSTOMARY these days to call the collectivists "radical" and the individualists "conservative". Yet, when you examine the terms you find they are both misnomers. The individualist certainly wants to conserve a tradition; but the tap-root of that tradition is the Christian doctrine of the dignity of man, with its correlative concept of innate rights; he is a radical because his thinking is rooted in an absolute. The collectivist, on the other hand, denies all absolutes, denies root causes, and insists that political experimentation is the answer to all progress.

The struggle between the two attitudes — the one measuring progress in terms of freedom, the other in terms of political power — has been going on for ages. If a score were kept, it would show that the collectivists have had the upper hand most of the time. We know that freedom was predominant when the Jews lived under a regime of judges, that in ancient Greece it was in partial ascendancy occasionally, that Rome had a spell of it before it attained "grandeur", that some of the American Indian tribes knew about freedom. But, on the whole, history records an almost uninterrupted reign of political absolutism.

The ideal of freedom came nearest being fulfilled in the American colonies; so deeply was it imbedded in the culture of the times that a comparatively mild threat to freedom was met with violence. And for a century and a quarter after the establishment of the Republic, political encroachment on private affairs was held to a minimum. As a consequence, material progress in the material sense went on a rampage; the amassing of capital, the multiplication of inventions, the production of goods and the rise of living standards during the nineteenth century in America make this period unique in the history of the world. In 1913 came the income tax, and this transfer of earnings from the individual to the State was necessarily accompanied by the transfer of sovereignty from the individual to the State. The goal of progress was reversed.

Today, a "progressive" is one who aches for more laws, more interventions, more restrictions on the individual, more government. These are the indicia of collectivism. To an individualist, on the other hand, progress consists of "removing laws and leaving the space blank"; to him, the present tendency is retrogressive, not progressive, for it is away from freedom. It is all a matter of goals.

The collectivist accuses the individualist of wanting to "turn back the clock". If by that glib phrase the collectivist means that the individualist aims to put back in circulation the values included in the Ten Commandments, the Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights — the charge is correct and the individualist proudly accepts it. But the collectivist is most impudent in making the charge; for he proposes to turn the hour hand of time back to the age of the Pharoahs, and to break off the minute hand altogether. What's new or progressive about slavery?

Additional Copies: 6—1.00; 10—1.50; 50—5.50; 100—10.00; 500—15.00; 1,000—25.00. Quotations for larger quantities on request.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor* FRANK CHODOROV, *Associate Editor*

Volume XI, No. 9 Wednesday, March 3, 1954 Washington, D. C.

RECEIVED MAR 8 1954

Crusade for Defeat: Convincing proof now exists of a formidable conspiracy directed from the White House — under the very nose of Ike — to destroy the Republican Party in the fall elections by liquidating Middle West Republicans. It is in this area that the GOP has been inflexibly opposed to the internationalism and socialism of the New Deal which the Eisenhower Administration seems determined to perpetuate and expand. If this hard core of GOP Americanism can be liquidated — the traditional two party system will be ended and the nation committed securely to a uniform policy of extending the New Deal whether under Republican or Democratic labels. The conspiracy is compounded of the following developments:

(1) In 1950 the ADA (Americans for Democratic Action — the socialist organization that dominated the Truman Administration) formally signified its intention of invading the Republican Party. Shortly thereafter newspaper columnists supporting the ADA began to report a new movement of "liberal Republicans" which eventually emerged as "Republican Advance". This group was spearheaded by Russell Davenport, *Time* and *Life* Editor, campaign manager for Wendell Willkie and ardent "one-worlder".

On July 4 of 1950, in Philadelphia, the new movement prepared a program in sharp opposition to that announced in February by House and Senate Republican leaders. The latter's program was an all-out attack on the socialism and Communism of the Truman Administration. "Republican Advance" proposed playing down a GOP campaign against socialism and Communists in government and adopted in substance the Truman line.

Among twenty-one Republican Congressmen indorsing this soft-pedaling program was Richard Nixon then campaigning for the Senate in California. To some observers Nixon's alliance with "Republican Advance" explains why after his election to the Senate he became mystifyingly apathetic towards Communism — though he had originally broken the Hiss case — and why he was picked to be Ike's running mate in '52. All of the 21 Congressmen indorsing "Republican Advance" were early in the field for the nomination of Eisenhower and all today are in high standing at the White House.

(2) A month after "Republican Advance" issued its program in opposition to that of GOP House and Senate leaders, Congressional investigators revealed that efforts of the ADA "seeking to infiltrate the Republican Party" were being directed from the White House by a Truman assistant — David D. Lloyd. While holding down a $10,000 post at the White House, Lloyd was reportedly "director of research and legislation" for the ADA and was also one of the 81 cases presented by Senator McCarthy to the Senate in February, 1950.

(3) Several months before the Republican convention in '52, a highly confidential document was circulated among a few top Republican leaders. It pointed out that in '32 Roosevelt had been elected on a traditional Democratic platform — but that within a very short time a radical wing within the party with the powerful aid of the Presidency had taken over the whole party. Citing the numerous left-wing supporters of the Eisenhower candidacy, the document — prepared by able researchers — warned that these were evidently counting on electing Eisenhower so that they could use the White House to accomplish in the Republican Party what other leftists had accomplished in the Democratic Party. Observers point out that after only one year of the Eisenhower Administration, it is ominously obvious how New Dealers, wearing the Republican label, have seized control of the White House.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1954 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(4) Last year the "Citizens for Ike Clubs" were reactivated — and from the White House — by Stanley Rumbough, on the White House Staff, and son-in-law of Mrs. Joseph Davies. According to John T. Flynn in the February *American Mercury*, Ike's financial interests in his writings including the rich haul he made off his book *Crusade In Europe* by a special income tax ruling, "is superintended by such a stalwart New Dealer as Joe Davies of *Mission To Moscow* fame".

In the reactivation of the "Ike Clubs", reliable sources inform us that "Republican Advance" was absorbed. Last December the reactivated organization was reported by Roscoe Drummond in the *Herald Tribune* as having prepared a program. He quoted parts of it and a check of the platforms of the ADA in June, 1953 and the Democratic Party in 1952 *reveals an astonishing similarity*.

(5) The February meeting this year of the Republican National Committee included a visitor, Mrs. Chapman Rose, the liaison representative between the "Citizens for Ike Clubs" and the National Committee. Mr. Rose is Assistant Secretary of the Treasury but also served under the Truman Administration. Mrs. Rose tried to give those present a glowing report on how the "Ike Clubs" would be of great help in the coming campaign — but a National Comitteewoman from the Middle West, threw the meeting into an uproar when she told how in Illinois the "Ike Clubs" were actually running in the primaries their own candidates for the House and Senate in opposition to present Republican incumbents.

(6) The national offices of the "Ike Clubs" are in the Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C. In one room there is a large map of the United States on a wall. There are solid clusters of blue pins on the Midwestern portion and very few elsewhere. An employee explained to a visitor that the pins represented localities which had requested financial help from national headquarters in the coming congressional campaign. Thus are confirmed reports that the purpose of "Citizens for Ike Clubs" is to unseat congressmen whose Americanism could never subscribe to an ADA-Democratic Party-Ike Clubs legislative program for New Deal socialism and internationalism.

Only an arising, well organized, within the GOP can prevent this crusade for defeat.

Crusade for Victory: Whatever the result of Senator Lennon's (D., N.C.) move to force the Senate to reconsider its defeat of the George Amendment, the fight to prevent treaties or executive agreements from changing the Constitution will go stoutly forward. Defeat of the George Amendment was at first deeply discouraging. Bricker supporters understood that the Georgia Senator had put forward his amendment (weaker than the revised Bricker Amendment) solely in a desperate effort to push something by the Senate and get it into the House where, it was expected, a much stronger amendment would emerge. Pessimism, however, was quickly succeeded by a fierce determination to carry the fight, if necessary, to the people while a closer review of what actually happened — and its significance — spurred hopes.

(1) In the defeat of the George Amendment the legend of Ike as the irresistibly popular leader in the White House was punctured. The President lost not only a majority of his own Party but a majority of the Democrats as well. Worse still, the Administration's floor leader in the Senate — Knowland (R., Cal.) — walked out on him.

(2) The great majority of those voting against the George Amendment was easily identified with such figures as Fulbright of Arkansas, the Rhodes Scholar; that UN idolator, Wiley of Wisconsin; the former State Department appointee of Acheson, Cooper of Kentucky; Bush, the international banker of Connecticut; the whirling dervish of world government, Kefauver of Tennessee; and the ADA henchmen of New Deal socialism, Humphrey of Minnesota and Ives of New York. Those voting against the George Amendment removed all doubts about their being puppets of the internationalists who are striving so frantically to abolish US sovereignty. The prospects that indignant and aroused home folks may greatly thin their ranks when they come up for re-election is accordingly heightened.

Puerto Rico: The vile attempt to assassinate members of Congress has, of course, focussed attention on the Communist menace, since most observers believe the shocking deed was inspired by the Reds. (Apart

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from direct evidence of Red influence, the opinion is that independence has nothing to do with the matter, because the U.S. has offered the territory independence and the population voted it down.)

Additionally, Congress is already facing up to the problem of tightening up security to protect members. Figures like McCarthy and Jenner should be given bodyguards, particularly in view of congressional committee evidence that the Reds discussed assassination of the former. Secretary of State Dulles (whose prestige is sliding downward because of his appeasement of the Chinese Reds recently) deserves rebuke for weak security in his Department by taking Personnel (power to hire and fire) out of the hands of Mr. Scott McLeod, the security chief who has been the first in many years to make a strong effort to purge State of security risks.

One other lesson is drawn from the bloody episode in the House. An economist was heard to say: "This is the end product of fifty years of Point IV". For Puerto Rico is indeed an example of Point IV, which means giving money and know-how to an "underdeveloped country" to "lift its standard of living", and we have been at it for over a half century. Since '98 an estimated billion dollars of private and government aid has been poured into the island; and the Puerto Ricans were given the right to emigrate to the U.S. and to sell freely to us. What have we got to show for it? All reports describe poverty, undernourishment, underdevelopment, overpopulation (the number of inhabitants has more than doubled since '98) — and assassination. The sanguinary episode this week can be of use, if it teaches us that Puerto Rico is an example of "Point IV" and that we should drop such unrewarding projects.

TV Front: We are indebted to the *Daily Worker* for confirming what we and many other persons had long thought about certain broadcasters on radio and TV. Last week we told you about how this Communist paper heaped praise on Frank Edwards and John Vandercook and also had a nice pat on the back for Ed Murrow. Edwards and Vandercook speak for the socialistic labor bosses, but Murrow is sponsored by that citadel of private enterprise — the Aluminum Company of America (ALCOA to you)— founded by Andrew Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury under Republican presidents in the Twenties.

The *Daily Worker* (February 26) has more praise for Murrow and his TV program "See It Now", but also sheds light on another TV personage who has long been a source of wonder to those hewing to the American line in the battle of Senator McCarthy versus Red infiltrators. This TV phenomenon is Walter Kronkite.

Judging from the *Daily Worker*, Kronkite's TV program "You Are There" is giving lusty support to those trying to down the Wisconsin Senator, while suggesting that the Rosenbergs who died in the electric chair after a completely fair trial for betraying the nation's atom secrets are guiltless martyrs. The Communist organ says: "And when the Rosenberg case was *reaching its climax* 'You Are There' presented a dramatization of the Dreyfus case showing how seemingly irrefutable evidence was based on lies and deceit is an engineered frame-up. At the same period Joan of Arc was presented showing the pressure put on her to confess."

The *Daily Worker* commends "You Are There" for doing a "special reenactment of the Salem Witchcraft trials which has particular significance for today's witch-hunts".

Commercial sponsors of Kronkite's "You Are There" are the Electric Companies Advertising Program (not connected with either the National Association of Electric Companies or the Edison Electrical Institute and the Prudential Life Insurance Company).

It is hardly encouraging to find such powerful private interests giving help to the Red front through a TV program which reaches millions.

Not Merely Gossip: The Air Corps has purchased 40,000 copies of *Wings For Peace* (Henry Regnery Co., Chicago) by General Bonner Fellers, for distribution to its instruction centers and personnel. This volume is a plea for the air concept of National Defense and was thoroughly buried, after its publication a year ago, by the New Deal corps of reviewers. The mass purchase of copies is symptomatic of the decision, last November, by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to discard mass ground warfare strategy in fa-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vor of reliance on our natural genius for air warfare. This was a view advocated (despite derision from the Truman-Fair Deal Government) by Senator Taft and ex-President Hoover. Fellers was an advisor to Taft and Hoover in defense matters.

● One 1956 presidential boom received no little impetus last week when Governor Allan Shivers of Texas made a talk here. He said little, but it was the way he said it — the sincerity, the rich and youthful spirit and attractive personality — which set tongues wagging about "Shivers in '56". One rumor arose — that Shivers is ambitious to win the Democratic nomination. But some who know him say no, say that in 1952 Shivers learned from the defeat of Senator Russell at Chicago. Russell, conservative Democrat from Georgia, waged a serious campaign for the head of the Democratic ticket, but was overwhelmed at the Chicago convention. Since then most Southern Democrats have felt that it is impossible for one of their number to overcome the opposition of the labor-"liberal" phalanx, who have demonstrated that they control Democratic conventions.

Rather, it is believed, Shivers would seek to lead a North-South coalition of conservatives, both Democrats and Republicans. It is surprising how much discussion goes on along that line here in Washington. Last week at a dinner, we sat near three prominent people — two of them GOP members of Congress — and the feature of the conversation was their demand for "realignment" in a "third party".

Book Front: *The Twenty-Year Revolution — From Roosevelt to Eisenhower*, by Chesly Manly. 272 pp. Index. Henry Regnery Company, Chicago. Price: $4.00.

"The question now is whether the American Republic, born in a patriotic revolution against foreign oppressors, can survive a stealthy, encroaching revolution, motivated by treasonous allegiance to alien ideologies." Thus Chesly Manly, noted correspondent of the *Chicago Tribune*, describes the issue confronting us today, and thereby states the theme of his excellent book.

McCarthy's summation is "twenty years of treason", a judgment in which Manly concurs. What Manly sees in clear perspective is that the New Deal of the early years of the regime of Franklin D. Roosevelt is but part of a revolution, planned and in large part executed by Soviet agents and their "liberal" dupes. Hence, the canvas of his book, crowded with characters whose interrelated careers have received proper attention from the FBI, extends from the days when the Union Square delegation left Pennsylvania Station for the District of Columbia, right down to this month when Senators Bricker and George grappled with a Senatorial opposition to their amendments filled with members of the Fair Deal.

Certain chapters merit special praise, such as "Roosevelt Rebels Against the Constitution"; "He Lied Us Into War"; "Unconditional Surrender — to Stalin"; "Truman, Traitors and Red Herrings"; "The United Nations Conspiracy"; and "Revolution by Treaty". It is no criticism of the author to say that in the UN chapter, he does not tell all he knows about that appalling institution. It is rumored that Manly (who has for some years covered the UN for the *Tribune*), is planning a book entirely devoted to that controversial subject.

But the author has not merely been confined to New York studying the incredible organization on the East River. He served many years in the Washington Bureau of his paper and is able to draw on his long background of knowledge of the Capital. (Many here recall his scoop on the military plans of FDR for sending a mass army abroad in 1941, at a time when the President was professing neutrality.) Manly lived through those years when Executive duplicity reached its height. The story he tells is well-documented, straight-from-the-shoulder and intensely American. *The Twenty-Year Revolution* should serve as an indispensable handbook for writers, lawyers, teachers, clubwomen and all opinion-formers in this election year.

Entered as second class matter at the Post Office, Washington, D. C. Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial Subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. First class mail, one year, $11.00; six months, $6.00. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscription or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED